

REMARKS:

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1, 3-11, 13, and 14 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims.

No new matter has been presented. Claims 2 and 12 remain cancelled.

Thus, claims 1, 3-11, 13, and 14 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103:

In item 5 on page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-11, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,205,478 (Sugano) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,480,885 (Olivier). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of the claims for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1, by way of example, recites "replacing, in a watcher list of the first client, an old identifier of the first client with a new identifier, and replacing identifiers of all watcher clients with one or more identifiers of the selected identifier notification recipients." Sugano and Olivier do not teach or suggest at least these features. Independent claims 10, 11, 13 and 14 also recite similar features.

At least on page 4 of the Office Action, the Office Action incorrectly states that appears to state that Sugano does not teach selecting "part of" watcher clients of the first client. Applicants respectfully submit that Sugano states:

"In accordance with the above described third embodiment, the timing notification of changes to user information can be controlled and predetermined As a result, the extra changes in information need not be notified to a person or user who is not specified to receive such updated information. Only predetermined users will be notified of specific types of updated or changed information."

(the last paragraph of the description about Fig. 12)

As can be seen from the above-description, Sugano notifies predetermined users which may or may not be "part of" the clients. However, Sugano discusses notifying all the predetermined recipients and is silent regarding "replacing an old identifier of the first client with a new identifier" and "replacing identifiers of all watcher clients with one or more identifiers of the selected identifier notification recipients", as taught by the claimed invention.

As mentioned above, the independent claims patentably distinguish over Sugano. Further, as Olivier merely discusses that a message sent to a mailing list is transmitted to all members included in the mailing list or a part of the members, Olivier does not cure the deficiencies of Sugano regarding claims of the present application.

Olivier is directed to a system where the message is sent to the members in the mailing list. However, the mailing list in Olivier is not updated nor changed. Olivier is thus silent regarding “replacing, in a watcher list of the first client, an old identifier of the first client with a new identifier, and replacing identifiers of all watcher clients with one or more identifiers of the selected identifier notification recipients”, as taught by the claimed invention.

Further, even assuming arguendo that Olivier does disclose the features discussed by the Examiner, the Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine Sugano and Olivier. The Examiner stated that the combination of the references would be obvious in order to provide users with greater control over transmission of electronic communication, create personalized and tunable groups, and reduce the quantity of unwanted electronic communications.

Applicants request that some reasoning with some rational underpinning be provided to support the legal conclusion of obviousness since absent improper hindsight the record, however, fails to provide the required evidence (rationale) of a motivation for a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform such modification. In this case, the rejection based on Sugano and Olivier is made by mere conclusory statements.

It is respectfully submitted that Sugano and Olivier are limited to notification to a predetermined list that is not changed and remains the same. Sugano and Olivier are silent regarding the above-identified claim feature including “replacing” the old watchers with the new watchers in the watcher list of the first client.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Sugano and Olivier. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 7, “transmitting display data for displaying the change of the identifier of the first client to one or more identifier notification recipients.” Sugano and Olivier do not teach or suggest these features of the claimed invention since neither teaches “change of the identifier of the first client”, as recited in claim 7.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 08/26/2010

By: 
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501